



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/721,806	11/24/2000	Richard Hans Harvey	0655/63676	3613

7590 01/20/2004

RICHARD F. JAWORSKI  
Cooper & Dunham LLP  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER
----------

PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

11

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/721,806

Applicant(s)

HARVEY, RICHARD HANS

Examiner

Sathyanarayan Pannala

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's Amendment filed on 11/14/2003 is without amending any claims. In this Final Office Action, claims 1-13 are pending.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

"A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made."

3. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corey et al. (US Patent 5,987,446), and in view of Carey et al. (US Patent 6,122,627) and further in view of Ciccarelli (US Patent 6,009,422).

4. As per independent claims 1, 13, Corey rendered by the following:

"receiving a service query" at Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 13-17;

"applying principles of logic to the service query to obtain a sum of terms" at Fig. 3A, col. 7, lines 47-67;

Corey (5,987,446) does not teach explicitly evaluating each SQL instruction.

However, Carey (6,122,627) teaches "evaluating each term as a separate SQL

instruction” at Fig. 9C, col. 13, lines 6-17; Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate evaluation of each SQL instruction. Corey and Carey are combined to relate querying database by receiving user query and analyzing it. In order to query for information from databases, it is necessary to simplify complex query into multiple simple queries.

Corey and Carey did teach analogous to executing SQL instructions. However, Ciccarelli specifically teaches:

“executing each separate SQL instruction” at Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 33-44. Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art of data processing at the time of the invention to teach the execution of SQL instructions. Corey, Carey and Ciccarelli are combined for teaching of executing SQL instructions. In order to view results of a query from databases, SQL instructions must be executed.

5. As per dependent claim 2, Ciccarelli teaches “expanding each term to remove NOT operators” at col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 7.

6. As per dependent claim 3, Ciccarelli teaches “a sum of terms are expanded using Boolean logic” at col. 2, lines 47-64.

7. As per dependent claims 4, 7, 10, 12, Bachmann teaches “the service query is an X.500 or LDAP service query” at Fig. 4A-C, col. 1, lines 51-52, col. 4, lines 22-35.

8. As per dependent claim 5, 8, Ciccarelli teaches “the service query is a search service query” at Fig. 1B, col. 6, lines 17-19.

9. As per independent claims 6, Carey rendered by the following:

“determining a SQL instruction representative of a function” (Carey teaching is analogous to the invention) at col. 8, lines 51-56;

“listing the results of a subtracted SQL instruction in a first list, listing the results of a non-subtracted SQL instruction in an second list” at col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 7;

“not listing results which are duplicates of previously listed subtracted or non-subtracted results” at col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 7.

10. Claims 9, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corey et al. (US Patent 5,987,446), and in view of Carey et al. (US Patent 6,122,627) and further in view of Ciccarelli (US Patent 6,009,422) and also further in view of Bachmann et al. (US Patent 6,085,188).

11. As per independent claims 9, 11, Corey, Carey and Ciccarelli combined teaches the following:

“means for processing a service query by applying principles of logic to the service query to obtain a sum of terms, evaluating each term as a separate SQL instruction, and executing each separate SQL instruction” (see claim 1 references for details).

Corey, Carey and Ciccarelli did not teach directory services relating to database. However, Bachmann teaches the following:

“A directory service arrangement including a database using a plurality of tables, each table having a plurality of rows and columns, and storing arbitrary data” at

Fig. 5, col. 4, line 65 to col. 5, line 9; Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art of data processing at the time of the invention to teach usage of directory system in a database. Corey, Carey, Ciccarelli and Bachmann are combined for teaching as all teaches querying database and to incorporate directory services. Directory service is needed in order to ease database administrative burdens of system administrators with data repository.

The other part of the claim limitation is the same as the claim 6, see the claim 6 for detailed references.

### ***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/14/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and details as follows:

a) Applicant's argument stated as "Accordingly it is submitted that neither Carey et al. nor Corey et al. alone or in combination, show or disclose applying principles of logic to a received service query to obtain a sum of terms, as recited in independent claim 1."

In response to the Applicant's argument, Examiner respectfully disagree with the Applicant because all limitations of claim 1 are taught together by Corey et al. (US Patent 5,987,446) and Carey et al. (US Patent 6,122,627). As an example, the first limitation of claim 1 ("receiving a service query") teaches by Corey at Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 13-17.

b) Applicant's argument states as "The section of Carey et al. cited by the Office Action ..." see Amendment Page 5, paragraph 5.

In response to Applicant's argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant since this limitation of the claim 6 is the teaching of Carey at col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 7. Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

### ***Conclusion***

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

15. If a reference indicated, as being mailed on PTO-FORM 892 has not been enclosed in this action, please contact Lisa Craney whose telephone number is (703) 305-9601 for faster service.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is (703) 305-3390. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

*SRP*  
Sathyanarayan Pannala  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2177

srp  
January 14, 2004

  
GRETA ROBINSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER